

2. The second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112 was noted and taken into consideration. The first line of our claim No 1 states: "A device for enhancing the maneuverability of a boat" which, at the time, we thought clearly defines what we claim.
3. Claim 2 was deleted and substituted by Claim 3, which contains no new matter and we hope, will be accepted by the Examiner.
4. We welcome the Office Action remark, that the narrative form of claims, is replete with functional and operational language and we will accept, with appreciation and carefully consider changing and /or correcting the "indefinite" part of it if, that part is clearly shown to us.

Our claims are in one sentence form only. A sentence starts with a capital letter and ends with a period. The only capital letter of No 1 claim is at the beginning of the top line, and the only period is at the end of the last line. The alphabetical letters at the beginning of each line are for easier identification, in case the Examiner wanted to make a comment or remark on a specific line.

5. Obviousness rejection. The Examiner has not presented a convincing line of reasoning as to why the claimed subject matter, as a whole including the differences over the prior art, would have been obvious.
The Examiner has made a strainer interpretation of the reference, which could be made only by hindsight.
6. The only claim that De Risi makes as a function, or a result, of all his claims is "A hydraulic system for the control of a vessel". Control of a vessel is a very wide and vague statement that we believe cannot be clearly used to reject our claims.

De Risi over Rice. Rice's invention US3,941,076 "teaches an engine driven waterjet maneuvering system, which when desired is further operative to pump water from the bilge as well as use pump output to fight fires."

Our obviousness answers to number 5 above can be used for De Risi over Rice and additionally:

The prior art lacks any suggestion that the reference should be modified in a manner required to meet the claim.

Each reference is complete and functional by itself and should be considered as such, without adding parts from other references to meet the claim.

7. The prior art, known to the applicant at the time, were the bowthrusters, which we mentioned were the ones that have propellers working electrically or hydraulically in a small tunnel in the boat's bow, transversally pushing water sideways.

Dunn US 4,265,192 has some similarities with ours in using water pressure thrusts through nozzles for maneuvering, and here the similarity ends, because his nozzles are "placed above the water line in a downwardly and outwardly inclined positions".

Kiliz et al "shows small boat thrusters." Kiliz US 6,024,038. in his "disclosure" states: "the present invention is directed to a side thruster, for a boat that satisfies his need for an uncomplicated auxiliary maneuvering system, that is easily portable, so that can be installed and removed from a boat relatively inexpensively and efficiently"

Our argument on this is that: An "easily portable maneuvering system for a small boat" should not be brought as reference to reject our claims which, as its title states is for Motorboats and Motoryachts, and it is to be permanently installed in the hull.

Finally, after reading and examining all references it becomes obvious that the applicant's invention can perform summarily all the desired functions mentioned therein, which the others can only partially perform individually and the former can do it in an easier, cheaper and more professional way.

Therefore, applicant submits, that claims 1 and 2, are allowable over the references cited and respectfully solicits reconsideration and allowance.

Very Respectfully Yours,



Captain Constantine N. Colyvas
59 Valorie Road
Southampton, N.Y. 11968